

Connecticut Judiciary Committee

I hereby testify that I OPPOSE HB6355 for the following (main) reasons:

1. This bill seems NOT to be in accordance to our Federal Constitution or in the spirit of USA jurisprudence. There is no DUE PROCESS for the accused. Simply on an "accusation" can an individual be deemed "guilty". This should not be the case.
2. This bill provides no "safeguard" to ensure the accused is not the victim of simply being the "enemy" of someone. Anyone with a differing view could easily be a target.
3. The bill seems to be very short on addressing any "unintended" consequence. I'm certain there will be consequences not thought of. One seems to me to have been put forth already by the proponents of the bill. The claim is that there is now an avenue that doesn't involve the police. This does not seem logically possible. Who exactly will confiscate the firearm? It seems to me that the police response will have to be heavier coming un-announced to confiscate a firearm when there has been no previous police contact.
4. Lastly - Who made the Judiciary experts in mental health? Can they now predict what someone will do in the future? What is the standard for "imminent threat"? There are lots of apparently unstable people who never commit crimes and there are lots of apparently stable people who do. An accusation is NOT a predictor of what someone might do.

There are several other points which I could raise but suffice it to say, I fully OPPOSE this legislation.

I trust you will consider these points as you evaluate and then vote on this legislation.

Tim Johnson
Old Saybrook